arXiv:1702.06564v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 21 Feb 2017

Polygons pulled from an adsorbing surface

A J Guttmann*, E J Janse van Rensburg†, I Jensen* and S G Whittington‡

*Department of Mathematics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
†Department of Mathematics & Statistics, York University, M3J 1P3, Toronto, Canada
‡Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, M5S 3H6, Toronto, Canada

23 February 2017

Abstract. We consider self-avoiding lattice polygons, in the square and cubic lattices, as a model of a ring polymer adsorbed at a surface and either being desorbed by the action of a force, or pushed towards the surface. We show that, when there is no interaction with the surface, then the response of the polygon to the applied force is identical (in the thermodynamic limit) for two ways in which we apply the force. When the polygon is attracted to the surface then, when the dimension is at least 3, we have a complete characterization of the critical force–temperature curve in terms of the behaviour, (a) when there is no force, and, (b) when there is no surface interaction. For the 2-dimensional case we have upper and lower bounds on the free energy.

1. Introduction

The theory of polymer adsorption at an impenetrable surface is a well established subject. Useful reviews can be found in [5] and [19]. One of the standard models is self-avoiding walks, confined to a half-space and interacting with the confining line or plane. For this problem we have some rigorous results [11, 18] that establish the existence of a phase transition and provide useful information about the behaviour of the free energy as the temperature is varied. More detailed information comes from a variety of numerical investigations that, among other things, give quite precise information about the location of the phase transition [2, 7, 9, 15, 22] and strongly suggest that the transition is second order [7, 15, 22].

With the advent of atomic force microscopy [14, 37] it has become possible to pull an adsorbed polymer off a surface at which it is adsorbed. In principle it is possible to measure the temperature dependence of the critical force for desorption and the stress-strain curves. It is only quite recently that the effects of a force have been investigated for the self-avoiding walk model [1, 9, 21, 23, 29, 30, 33].

Consider the d-dimensional hypercubic lattice, $\mathbb{Z}^d$, and attach a coordinate system $(x_1, x_2, \ldots x_d)$ so that each vertex of the lattice has integer coordinates. Suppose that c_n^+ is the number of n-edge self-avoiding walks that start at $(0, 0, \ldots 0)$ and have all vertices in the half-space $x_d \geq 0$. It is known [36] that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log c_n^+ = \kappa_d \tag{1.1}$$

where κ_d is the *connective constant* of the lattice [10]. Each vertex of the walk in the hyperplane $x_d = 0$ is called a *visit*. Let $c_n^+(v, h)$ be the number of these walks with $v + 1$ visits and having the x_d-coordinate of their last vertex equal to h, which we call the *height* of the last vertex. Define the partition function

$$C_n^+(a, y) = \sum_{v,h} c_n^+(v, h) a^v y^h. \tag{1.2}$$

It is known [23] that the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log C_n^+(a, y) = \psi(a, y) \tag{1.3}$$

exists. $\psi(a, y)$ is the (reduced, limiting) free energy.

We can interpret the two fugacities a and y as

$$a = \exp(-\epsilon/k_B T) \quad \text{and} \quad y = \exp(f/k_B T) \tag{1.4}$$

where k_B is Boltzmann's constant, T is the absolute temperature, ϵ is the energy associated with a vertex in the surface and f is the force applied at the last vertex, normal to the surface. For adsorption to occur $\epsilon < 0$ so that the interaction with the surface is attractive. For the walk to be desorbed by the action of the force $f > 0$.

If we set $f = 0$ so that $y = 1$ we have the pure adsorption problem. Write $\psi(a, 1) = \kappa(a)$, the free energy for pure adsorption. We know [11, 18] that there is a critical value of a, $a_c > 1$, such that $\kappa(a) = \kappa(1) = \kappa_d$ for $a \leq a_c$ and $\kappa(a) > \kappa(1)$ for $a > a_c$ so that the free energy is singular at $a = a_c$, corresponding to the adsorption transition. Similarly if we set $\epsilon = 0$ so that $a = 1$ we have no (attractive) interaction with the surface and there is no adsorbed phase. The free energy is $\lambda(y) = \psi(1, y)$ and we know that $\lambda(y)$ is singular at $y = y_c = 1$ [1]. There is a transition from a *free phase* to a *ballistic phase* at $y = 1$ [1]. See also [16, 17].



Figure 1. A polygon in a slab of height ℓ. If $\ell = \infty$ the polygon is in a half-space.

Returning to the full problem, we know [23] that for $a \geq a_c$ and $y \geq 1$

$$\psi(a, y) = \max[\kappa(a), \lambda(y)]. \tag{1.5}$$

This gives a complete characterization of the phase boundary between the adsorbed and ballistic phases in terms of the behaviour when $\epsilon = 0$ and when $f = 0$. This was used in [9] to give very precise numerical estimates of the location of the phase boundary when $d = 2$. (Numerical estimates using a different approach are given in [30] for both $d = 2$ and $d = 3$.) In addition we know [9] that the phase transition from the adsorbed to the ballistic phase is first order.

These results raise a variety of new questions. For the self-avoiding walk model, what happens if the force is applied somewhere other than at the last vertex? What happens if the force is applied at an angle to the surface? Are there important differences if we consider different polymer architectures? For instance, what happens if we pull an adsorbed ring polymer, or an adsorbed star polymer?

Does it matter where the force is applied? If the force is applied at the *top* vertex, *i.e.* at the vertex furthest from the surface, this is equivalent to confining the walk (or polygon, etc.) between two parallel lines or planes and requiring at least one vertex in each plane, then applying a force to move the confining plane. For the walk problem we know that the limiting free energy is the same when the force is applied in this way or at the terminal vertex [24, 25]. If the force is applied at an interior vertex, the free energy depends on at which vertex the force is applied and, in some circumstances, an additional phase can be present [26].

In this paper we begin to investigate the issue of polymer architecture. We consider a ring polymer adsorbed at a surface, being pulled off the surface by a force applied in a particular way.

2. Definition of the model and statement of results

A standard model of ring polymers is *lattice polygons* or *polygons*, for short. (These are embeddings of the circle graph in a lattice. Each vertex has degree 2.) Let p_n be the number of (undirected, unrooted) n-edge polygons in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, counted modulo translation. In two dimensions, $p_4 = 1$, $p_6 = 2$, $p_8 = 7$, etc. Clearly $p_{2m+1} = 0$. Let $p_n(v, s)$ be the number of n-edge polygons with all vertices



Figure 2. The phase diagram of pulled adsorbing polygons in $d \geq 3$ dimensions. For $y \leq 1$ and $a \leq a_c^0$ the free energy is $\psi_0 = \log \mu$. This corresponds to a free phase with phase boundaries separating it from the ballistic phase at $y = 1$ and from the adsorbed phase. In the ballistic phase the free energy is $\psi_0 = \lambda_0(y) = \lambda(\sqrt{y})$. In the adsorbed phase the free energy is $\psi_0 = \kappa_0(a) = \kappa(a)$. The solution of $\lambda_0(y) = \kappa_0(a)$ is a critical curve $y_c(a)$ separating the ballistic and adsorbed phases.

having $x_d \geq 0$, $v + 2$ visits ($v \geq 0$) and span in the x_d-direction equal to s, counted modulo translation parallel to the surface.

Define the partition function

$$P_n(a, y) = \sum_{v \geq 0, s \geq 0} p_n(v, s) a^v y^s. \tag{2.1}$$

The fugacities are again interpreted as in eqn (1.4) and now the force is applied at the highest vertex.

In this paper we show that in $d \geq 3$ dimensions this model has a thermodynamic limit with free energy defined by

$$\psi_0(a, y) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \log P_n(a, y). \tag{2.2}$$

In addition, we show that, in this case, for $a \geq a_c^0$ (where a_c^0 is the critical adsorption fugacity for adsorbing polygons) and $y \geq 1$,

$$\psi_0(a, y) = \max[\kappa_0(a), \lambda_0(y)] \tag{2.3}$$

where $\kappa_0(a)$ is the free energy of adsorbing polygons in the absence of a pulling force, and $\lambda_0(y)$ is the free energy of a pulled polygon in the absence of an adsorption fugacity. The resulting phase diagram of this model is sketched in figure 2. We know that the phase boundary between the free phase and the adsorbed phase is a vertical line, and the phase boundary between the free phase and the ballistic phase is a horizontal line.

In $d = 2$ dimensions, our results are less complete.

3. Polygons adsorbing at a surface

If we consider polygons adsorbing at a surface with no applied force ($y = 1$) we have the following theorem:

Theorem 1 (Soteros) *The thermodynamic limit*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a, 1) \equiv \kappa_0(a) < \infty \tag{3.1}$$

exists. Moreover, $\kappa_0(a)$ is a convex function of $\log a$ and hence is continuous and differentiable almost everywhere.

The proof of this theorem follows from results in [34], in Sections 3 and 4.

When $d \geq 3$ it is relatively straightforward to show that $\kappa_0(a) = \kappa(a)$ so the location of the adsorption transition is the same as that of walks. See Section 3 of [34] for a proof when $d = 3$ that can be extended to $d > 3$ without much difficulty. When $d = 2$ the situation is slightly different because a polygon cannot lie entirely in the confining line. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (Soteros) *Suppose that $d = 2$. When $a \leq 1$ then $\kappa_0(a) = \kappa_0(1) = \kappa_2$. When $a > 1$*

$$\max[\kappa_2, (1/2)\log a] \leq \kappa_0(a) \leq \kappa_2 + (1/2)\log a. \tag{3.2}$$

A proof is given in Section 4 of [34].

This theorem implies that there is an adsorption transition at $a = a_c^0$ where

$$1 \leq a_c^0 \leq \exp[2\kappa_2] \tag{3.3}$$

and, with a little more effort, the upper bound can be made strict. By deleting a suitable edge each polygon can be converted into a terminally attached self-avoiding walk so $\kappa_0(a) \leq \kappa(a)$ and this implies that $a_c^0 \geq a_c$. Since we know [11] that $a_c > 1$ this implies that $a_c^0 > 1$ so both inequalities in (3.3) are strict. It is an open question as to whether the two critical points are identical or different.

4. Polygons pulled from a non-interacting surface

In this section we consider a polygon attached to an impenetrable surface and pulled away from the surface. There is no attractive interaction so $a = 1$. The force is conjugate to the span (s) of the polygon in the x_d-direction and the partition function is

$$P_n(1, y) = \sum_{v\geq 0, s\geq 0} p_n(v, s) y^s. \tag{4.1}$$

The existence of the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(1, y) = \lambda_0(y) \tag{4.2}$$

is established in [20]. In addition we know [20] that $\lambda_0(y)$ is a convex function of $\log y$ (and hence continuous) and, for $y \geq 1$, $\lambda_0(y)$ satisfies the bounds

$$\max[\lambda_0(1), (1/2)\log y] \leq \lambda_0(y) \leq \lambda_0(1) + (1/2)\log y. \tag{4.3}$$

Note that $\lambda_0(1) = \kappa_d$.

4.1. Polygons in a slit or slab

It will be useful to consider polygons with at least one vertex in the bottom boundary of a slit or slab of width w in the hypercubic lattice. Let $\pi_n(w)$ be the number of polygons of length n with highest vertices at height w, so that they fit in a slab or slit of width w (see figure), counted modulo translation parallel to the confining boundaries.

The generating function of this model is

$$\Pi(t,y) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{w=0}^{n/2} \pi_n(w)\, y^w t^n, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\pi_n(w) = \sum_v p_n(v,w)$. If $0 \le y \le 1$, by monotonicity,

$$G(t) = \Pi(t,1) \ge \Pi(t,y), \tag{4.5}$$

where $G(t)$ is the generating function of polygons in a half-lattice. It is known that $G(t)$ is singular at $t = t_c = \frac{1}{\mu} = e^{-\kappa_d}$.

Suppose that $d \ge 3$. Then it is known

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log \pi_n(w) = \log \mu_w \tag{4.6}$$

exists where μ_w is the growth constant for self-avoiding walks in a slab of width w [13]. It is proved there that $\mu_w < \mu_{w+1}$ and $\lim_{w\to\infty} \mu_w = \mu$. $\Pi(t,y)$ is bounded from below by any term in its defining series:

$$\Pi(t,y) \ge y^w \sum_{n=2w}^{\infty} \pi_n(w)\, t^n = y^w\, G_w(t). \tag{4.7}$$

$G_w(t)$ is singular at $t_w = \frac{1}{\mu_w}$.

The above gives

$$G(t) \ge \Pi(t,y) \ge y^w\, G_w(t), \quad \text{if } y \le 1, \text{ for every } w \ge 0. \tag{4.8}$$

The generating functions $G(t)$ and $G_w(t)$ have radius of convergence $\frac{1}{\mu}$ and $\frac{1}{\mu_w}$ respectively, where $\mu_w < \mu$. This shows, that for any fixed $0 < y \le 1$, the radius of convergence of $\Pi(t,y)$ is $\frac{1}{\mu_0(y)}$, where

$$\mu \ge \mu_0(y) \ge \mu_w. \tag{4.9}$$

Since $\mu_w \nearrow \mu$ as $w \to \infty$, this shows that

$$\mu_0(y) = \mu, \quad \text{for all } 0 < y \le 1 \tag{4.10}$$

for all $d \ge 3$.

It remains to consider the case of $d = 2$. There we know that the growth constant μ_w^0 for polygons in a slab of width w is strictly less than that of walks in a slab of width w, *i.e.* $\mu_w^0 < \mu_w$ for all $w < \infty$ [35]. The same argument shows that

$$\mu \ge \mu_0(y) \ge \mu_w^0 \tag{4.11}$$

and we give some properties of μ_w^0 in the next theorem.

Theorem 3 *For polygons in a two dimensional slit μ_w^0 is an increasing function of w and $\sup_w \mu_w^0 = \mu$.*

Proof: Every polygon with n edges and span w can be converted to a polygon with $n+2$ edges and span $w+1$ so $\pi_{n+2}(w+1) \geq \pi_n(w)$, from which we have $\mu^0_{w+1} \geq \mu^0_w$. The existence of the limit $\lim_{w\to\infty} \mu^0_w$ and the fact that it is equal to $\sup_w \mu^0_w$ and that this in turn is equal to μ is a consequence of the arguments in Sections 4 and 6 of [13]. □

Since $\sup_w \mu^0_w = \mu$ (by the above Theorem) it follows from (4.11) that $\mu_0(y) = \mu$ for all $y \leq 1$ in two dimensions, and therefore for all $d \geq 2$.

4.2. Polygons pulled at a middle vertex

Consider n-edge polygons (n is automatically even) with at least one vertex in the adsorbing plane and with all vertices in or on one side of this plane. Translate the polygon so that the lexicographically first vertex in the surface is at the origin. The *middle vertex* is the vertex joined to the origin by two sub-walks each of length $n/2$.

Let $c^+_n(h)$ be the number of positive walks from the origin of endpoint at height h above the adsorbing plane, and $p^+_n(h)$ be the number of polygons with middle vertex at height h. Note that $\sum_h c^+_n(h) = c^+_n$. Let $C^+_n(y)$ be the partition function of $c^+_n(h)$ and $P^+_n(y)$ be the partition function of $p^+_n(h)$, with growth constants $\mu^+_c(y)$ and $\mu^+_p(y)$. The free energies are $\lambda^+(y) = \log \mu^+_c(y)$ and $\lambda^+_p(y) = \log \mu^+_p(y)$. The partition function $P^+_n(y)$ is the partition function of polygons pulled at their middle vertex and $C^+_n(y)$ is the corresponding partition function for walks pulled at their last vertex.

We define the generating functions

$$W^+(t,y) = \sum_n C^+_n(y)t^n \qquad P^+(t,y) = \sum_n P^+_n(y)t^n \tag{4.12}$$

and we write their radii of convergence as $t^+_c(y)$ and $t^+_p(y)$.

We now define similar quantities for bridges. A bridge is a positive walk that takes its first step away from the adsorbing plane, never returns to the adsorbing plane and whose last vertex is in the top plane of the walk. Let $b_n(h)$ be the number of n-edge bridges of height h. The partition function and generating function are defined as

$$B_n(y) = \sum_h b_n(h)y^h \qquad B(t,y) = \sum_n B_n(y)t^n. \tag{4.13}$$

A bridge can be doubly unfolded in the first coordinate direction so that the origin is left-most and the first coordinate of the last vertex is right-most [12].

Let $b^\dagger_n(h)$ be the number of doubly unfolded bridges with n edges and height h. Then

$$b^\dagger_n(h) \leq b_n(h) \leq e^{o(n)} b^\dagger_n(h).$$

Their partition functions are related by the inequalities,

$$B^\dagger_n(y) \leq B_n(y) \leq e^{o(n)} B^\dagger_n(y), \tag{4.14}$$

and so $\lim_{n\to\infty}(B^\dagger_n(y))^{1/n} = \mu^B_c(y)$ where $\mu^B_c(y) = 1/t^B_c(y) = 1/t^+_c(y)$. This last equality follows from Lemma 1 and Theorem 3 in [24].



Figure 3. A doubly unfolded bridge. The vertex in the surface is in the left-most plane and the last vertex is in the right-most plane. The bridge steps away from the surface at its first step and never returns.

4.3. A connection between polygon and walk partition functions

Clearly $t_c^+(y) \le t_p^+(y)$ for all $y > 0$ and $t_c^+(1) = t_p^+(1) = \mu^{-1}$. If $y > 1$ then $P_n^+(y) \le p_n y^{n/2}$ and $C_n^+(y) \ge y^n$. Taking powers $1/n$ and then letting $n \to \infty$ gives $\mu_p^+(y) \le \mu\sqrt{y} < y \le \mu_c^+(y)$ for $y > \mu^2$, or

$$t_p^+(y) > t_c^+(y), \quad \text{for } y > \mu^2. \tag{4.15}$$

We next show how this inequality can be strengthened.

Theorem 4

$$t_p^+(y^2) \ge t_c^+(y), \textit{ for all } y \ge 1.$$

Proof: By cutting the polygon at its middle vertex (where the force is applied) into two walks, $p_n^+(h) \le (c_{n/2}^+(h))^2$, so that

$$P_n^+(y) = \sum_h p_n^+(h) y^h \le \sum_h \left(c_{n/2}^+(h) y^{h/2}\right)^2 \le \left(\sum_h c_{n/2}^+(h) y^{h/2}\right)^2 = (C_{n/2}^+(\sqrt{y}))^2. \tag{4.16}$$

Take the power $1/n$ and let $n \to \infty$ to obtain $\mu_p^+(y) \le \mu_c^+(\sqrt{y})$. That is

$$t_p^+(y^2) \ge t_c^+(y), \quad \text{for } y \ge 1.$$

□

A corollary of this Theorem is as follows. The free energy of pulled walks is $-\log t_c^+(y)$, and this is strictly increasing with $y > 1$, since the model is ballistic. That is, $t_c^+(y) > t_c^+(y^2)$ if $y > 1$. This shows with the above that $t_p^+(y^2) \ge t_c^+(y) > t_c^+(y^2)$ for $y > 1$, or $t_p^+(y) > t_c^+(y)$ whenever $y > 1$. This strengthens (4.15).

We next prove the corresponding inequality in the other direction. We obtain a lower bound by constructing polygons by concatenating four doubly unfolded bridges. The unfolded bridge has a width $\vec{w}$ and a height h, where $\vec{w}$ is the vector of widths in all except the vertical direction, and may look as illustrated in figure 3.



Figure 4. Four doubly unfolded bridges can be concatenated to form a polygon. The bridges are selected so that their heights and widths have their most popular values.

Next, we have to choose values for h and $\vec{w}$. Let $b_n^\dagger(h,\vec{w})$ be the number of n-edge doubly unfolded bridges with width $\vec{w}$ and height h. In the partition function for doubly unfolded bridges, $B_n^\dagger(y) = \sum_{h,\vec{w}} b_n^\dagger(h,\vec{w})y^h$ there are *most popular values* of h and $\vec{w}$ (these are functions of y); denote them by h^* and $\vec{w}^*$. Then $b_n^\dagger(h^*,\vec{w}^*)y^{h^*}$ is a largest term in $B_n^\dagger(y) = \sum_{h,\vec{w}} b_n^\dagger(h,\vec{w})y^h$, so that

$$b_n^\dagger(h^*,\vec{w}^*)y^{h^*} \le B_n^\dagger(y) \le (n+1)^d\, b_n^\dagger(h^*,\vec{w}^*)y^{h^*}. \tag{4.17}$$

Taking powers $1/n$, letting $n\to\infty$, and noting that $(B_n^\dagger(y))^{1/n} \to \mu_c^B(y)$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (b_n^\dagger(h^*,\vec{w}^*)y^{h^*})^{1/n} = \mu_c^B(y) = 1/t_c^B(y) = 1/t_c^+(y). \tag{4.18}$$

Theorem 5

$$t_p^+(y^2) = t_c^+(y) \quad \textit{for all } y \ge 1.$$

Proof: Because of Theorem 4 above we only need to prove an inequality in one direction. By reflecting and rotating unfolded bridges of most popular widths and heights they can be concatenated to form a polygon as in figure 4.

This arrangement gives a lower bound on polygons of height $2h^*$ and of length $4n+2$ which gives a lower bound on the polygon partition function:

$$\left(b_n^\dagger(h^*,\vec{w}^*)y^{h^*}\right)^4 \le \left(p_{4n+2}^+(2h^*)y^{4h^*}\right) \le P_{4n+2}^+(y^2). \tag{4.19}$$

Take the power $1/4n$ and then let $n\to\infty$. The left hand side goes to $1/t_c^+(y)$, and the right hand side goes to $\mu_p^+(y^2) = 1/t_p^+(y^2)$. This shows that

$$t_p^+(y^2) \le t_c^+(y).$$

Since we already know that $t_p^+(y^2) \ge t_c^+(y)$ the result is that

$$t_p^+(y^2) = t_c^+(y). \tag{4.20}$$

This shows that polygons also become ballistic at $y_c = 1$. □



Figure 5. A polygon in a slit or slab unfolded to form a loop.

We turn our attention now to the case where $y \leq 1$. The construction in Figure 3, together with eqns (4.17) and (4.19), shows that

$$\frac{1}{(n+1)^{4d}}(B_n^\dagger(y))^4 \leq (b_n^\dagger(h^*, \vec{w}^*)y^{h^*})^4 \leq p^+_{4n+2}(2h^*)y^{4h^*} \leq P^+_{4n+2}(y^2). \tag{4.21}$$

Recall that h^* and $\vec{w}^*$ are the most popular values of the height and width. We know that, for $y \leq 1$, $t_c^+(y) = t_c^B(y) = 1/\mu$ [24]. Hence $1/\mu \geq t_p^+(y^2) \geq t_c^+(y^2) = 1/\mu$ for all $y \leq 1$. This proves the following theorem:

Theorem 6 *When* $y \leq 1$ $t_p^+(y) = \frac{1}{\mu}$.

5. Polygons pulled from their top plane

Define $p_n(\ell)$ to be the number of polygons, with at least one vertex in $x_d = 0$ and with *highest vertices* at height ℓ. A model of pulled polygons, where the highest vertices are pulled vertically by a force f, is defined by the partition function

$$P_n(y) = \sum_{\ell \geq 0} p_n(\ell)\, y^\ell. \tag{5.1}$$

Here, the activity $y = e^{f/k_BT}$ is introduced and is equal to the exponential of the reduced pulling force. The generating function of this model is given by $P(t, y)$ and its radius of convergence is denoted $t_p(y)$.

It remains to relate the limiting free energy of this model to that of polygons pulled in the middle, considered above. Note that the midpoint of a polygon of height ℓ is itself at most at height ℓ. Thus, assuming that $y \geq 1$, $P_n^+(y) \leq P_n(y)$. This shows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^+(y) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y). \tag{5.2}$$

This, in particular, shows that $t_c^+(\sqrt{y}) = t_p^+(y) \geq t_p(y)$.

Existence of the free energy will now be shown by bounding the limiting supremum.

Cut the polygon at its lexicographically first vertex in the surface, and unfold it into a bridge in the x_1-direction (by finally adding a single edge in the horizontal direction). This is schematically illustrated in figure 5.

The polygon is unfolded into a loop of height ℓ. Denote the partition function of these (unfolded) loops by $L_n^\ddagger(y)$, and it follows that $P_n(y) \leq e^{o(n)} L_n^\ddagger(y)$. Let the number of unfolded loops of length n and height ℓ be denoted by $l_n^\ddagger(\ell)$. Then

$$L_n^\ddagger(y) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n/2} l_n^\ddagger(\ell)\, y^\ell. \tag{5.3}$$



Figure 6. An unfolded loop with its last step in the surface, with height equal to the most popular height ℓ^*. On the right is a schematic diagram of this class of loops.



Figure 7. Two unfolded loops are concatenated in a slab of height ℓ^* and then reflected through the top boundary of the slab to obtain a loop in a slab of height $2\ell^*$.

For each value of $y > 0$ there is a most popular value of ℓ in this summation, and this is denoted by ℓ^* (this is dependent on y and on n). In particular,

$$l_n^{\ddagger}(\ell^*)\, y^{\ell^*} \le L_n^{\ddagger}(y) \le \tfrac{1}{2} n\, l_n^{\ddagger}(\ell^*)\, y^{\ell^*}. \tag{5.4}$$

The loops in this most popular class are schematically illustrated in figure 6.

Two loops in this most popular class can be concatenated as illustrated schematically in figure 7. If the middle part of the concatenated loops is reflected through the top plane as shown, then a loop of height $2\ell^*$ is obtained with the property that its middle vertex is also in the top plane. This loop consists of two self-avoiding walks of length n and height $2\ell^*$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4}{n^2} L_n^{\ddagger 2}(y) &\le \left(l_n^{\ddagger}(\ell^*)\, y^{\ell^*}\right)^2 \le \left(c_n^{+}(2\ell^*)\, y^{\ell^*}\right)^2 \\ &\le \sum_{\ell} \left(c_n^{+}(\ell)\, y^{\ell/2}\right)^2 \le \left(\sum_{\ell} c_n^{+}(\ell)\, y^{\ell/2}\right)^2 = (C_n^{+}(\sqrt{y}))^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

That is, since $P_n(y) \le e^{o(n)} L_n^{\ddagger}(y)$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log C_n^{+}(\sqrt{y}) \tag{5.6}$$

with the result that by equation (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned} -\log t_p^{+}(y) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^{+}(y) \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y) \le \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log C_n^{+}(\sqrt{y}) \\ &= -\log t_c^{+}(\sqrt{y}) = -\log t_p^{+}(y). \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

Here, recall that $P_n^{+}(y)$ is the partition function of polygons pulled in the middle, $P_n(y)$ is the partition function of polygons pulled in their highest plane, and $C_n^{+}(\sqrt{y})$ is the partition function of walks pulled at their endpoint, and $y \ge 1$.

By equation (4.20) this shows that for polygons pulled in their top plane,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y) = -\log t_c^+(\sqrt{y}) = -\log t_p^+(y). \tag{5.8}$$

That is, the free energy of polygons pulled at their middle point is equal to the free energy of polygons pulled in their top plane if $y \geq 1$. The case of $y \leq 1$ follows from Figure 3 and the proof of Theorem 6. This gives the following theorem:

Theorem 7

$$\lambda_0(y) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(y) = -\log t_c^+(\sqrt{y}) = -\log t_p^+(y)$$

for all $y > 0$. *When* $y \leq 1$ *this is equal to* $\log \mu$.

For polygons, as well as for walks, there is a phase transition to a ballistic phase at $y = 1$ but the response of polygons and walks is different in this ballistic phase.

6. Polygons pulled from an interacting surface

In this section we consider the full problem where the polygon interacts with the surface ($a \neq 1$) and the applied force is pulling the polymer off the surface in its top plane ($y > 1$). We derive some results about the a-dependence of the free energy at fixed $y > 1$ and show that there is a phase transition from an adsorbed phase to a ballistic phase at $a = a_c^0(y)$.

First consider the situation when $y > 0$ and $a \leq 1$.

Theorem 8 *For* $y > 0$ *and* $a \leq 1$ *the thermodynamic limit*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a, y) \equiv \psi_0(a, y) \tag{6.1}$$

exists so we have a well defined limiting free energy. Moreover, in this region of the (a, y)*-plane the free energy is independent of* a *so that* $\psi_0(a, y) = \psi_0(1, y) = \lambda_0(y)$.

Proof: For fixed $y > 0$ and for all $a \leq 1$, by monotonicity

$$P_n(0, y) \leq P_n(a, y) \leq P_n(1, y). \tag{6.2}$$

Consider an n-edge polygon ω with span s. Suppose that $V(\omega)$ is the vertex of ω in the surface (*i.e.* that is a visit) with lexicographically first coordinates in the surface. When $d = 2$ there is exactly one edge of ω in the surface that is incident on V. For $d > 2$, if there are two such edges, choose the one with lexicographically first mid-point. Delete this edge in the surface, incident on V, translate ω by unit distance away from the surface, add two edges to connect the resulting walk to the surface and add an edge in the surface to obtain a polygon ω' with $n + 2$ edges and span $s + 1$ with exactly two visits.

$$\sum_v p_n(v, s) \leq p_{n+2}(0, s + 1). \tag{6.3}$$

This implies that

$$P_n(1, y) \leq \tfrac{1}{y} P_{n+2}(0, y) \tag{6.4}$$

and hence, from (6.2),

$$yP_{n-2}(1, y) \leq P_n(0, y) \leq P_n(a, y) \leq P_n(1, y). \tag{6.5}$$

Take logarithms, divide by n, let $n \to \infty$, and the result follows. □

When $y \geq 1$ and $a \geq 1$ we have two useful lower bounds on the partition function that follow from monotonicity, namely

$$P_n(a,y) \geq P_n(a,1) \quad \text{and} \quad P_n(a,y) \geq P_n(1,y). \tag{6.6}$$

These bounds imply that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) \geq \max[\kappa_0(a), \lambda_0(y)]. \tag{6.7}$$

We can also construct an upper bound similar to the one derived for the self-avoiding walk model [23]. Let $l_n(h)$ be the number of loops (or arches) with n edges and span in the x_d-direction equal to h. Write the partition function as

$$L_n(y) = \sum_h l_n(h) y^h. \tag{6.8}$$

Theorem 9 *For all $d \geq 2$*

$$P_n(a,y) \leq y^{-1} \sum_m C_m(a,1)\, L_{n-m+2}(y) \tag{6.9}$$

Proof: Every n-edge polygon with span h must have at least one edge with $x_d = h$. Either the polygon has every edge in $x_d = 0$ so that $h = 0$, or $h \geq 1$. If $h = 0$ choose the edge that is lexicographically first and add two edges to the polygon just before and just after the distinguished edge in $x_d = 0$ to produce a unique edge in $x_d = 1$ in a singe loop of 3 edges. If $h \geq 1$ choose the edge in $x_d = h$ that is lexicographically first. This edge must be in a loop with, say, $n - m$ edges. The remainder of the polygon is a walk with m edges. Add two edges to the loop just before and just after the distinguished edge in $x_d = h$ to produce a unique edge in $x_d = h + 1$. This unique edge distinguishes the loop of length $n - m + 2$ from the rest of the polygon. By noting that the rest of the polygon is a walk of length m, the following inequality is obtained:

$$p_n(v,h) \leq \sum_m c_m(v)\, l_{n-m+2}(h+1) \tag{6.10}$$

where $c_m(v) = \sum_h c_m^+(v,h)$. Now multiply both sides by $y^h a^v$ and sum over h and v giving (6.9) which proves the theorem. □

Define the generating functions

$$\widehat{L}(t,y) = \sum_n L_n(y) t^n \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{C}(t,a) = \sum_n C_n^+(a,1) t^n. \tag{6.11}$$

By the convolution theorem

$$\sum_n \sum_m C_m(a,1) L_{n-m+2}(y) t^n \leq t^{-2} \widehat{C}(a,t) \widehat{L}(y,t) = t^{-2} \widehat{B}(a,y,t). \tag{6.12}$$

The radius of convergence of $\widehat{C}(t,a)$ is $t_1(a) = \exp[-\kappa(a)]$ and the radius of convergence of $\widehat{L}(t,y)$ is $t_2(y)$ so the radius of convergence of $\widehat{B}(a,y,z)$ is $\min[t_1(a), t_2(y)]$. This implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) \leq \max[\kappa(a), \liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log L_n(y)] \tag{6.13}$$

or, roughly, the free energy of pulled polygons interacting with the surface is bounded above by the maximum of the free energy of walks interacting with the surface and pulled loops.

By the results in section 5 (see equation (5.5)) it follows

$$e^{o(n)} P_n(y) \leq L_n^{\ddagger}(y) \leq e^{o(n)} C_n^+(\sqrt{y}) = e^{o(n)} P_n(y). \tag{6.14}$$

Taking logarithms, dividing by n, and letting $n \to \infty$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \log L_n^{\ddagger}(y) = -\log t_p(y).$$

But, by unfolding loops, it follows that $e^{o(n)} L_n(y) \le L_n^{\ddagger}(y) \le L_n(y)$. Thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \tfrac{1}{n} \log L_n(y) = -\log t_p(y). \tag{6.15}$$

In equation (6.13) this gives

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) \le \max[\kappa(a), \lambda_0(y)] \tag{6.16}$$

When $d > 2$ we know that $\kappa_0(a) = \kappa(a)$ [34] so the above result can be replaced with

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) = \max[\kappa_0(a), \lambda_0(y)], \quad d \ge 3. \tag{6.17}$$

This gives a complete characterization of the phase boundary when $d \ge 3$ and we state this as a Theorem.

Theorem 10 *When $d \ge 3$ the phase boundary between the ballistic and adsorbed phases for $y \ge 1$ is determined by the solution of the equation $\kappa_0(a) = \lambda_0(y)$.*

Proof: This follows immediately from (6.17). □

Since $\kappa_0(a) = \kappa(a)$ [34] and $\lambda_0(y) = \lambda(\sqrt{y})$ the phase boundary is determined by the properties of the self-avoiding walk problem. We know the asymptotics of both $\kappa(a)$ [31] and $\lambda(y)$ [23] so we know the behaviour of the phase boundary for polygons at large values of a. We can switch into the force-temperature plane and this corresponds to the behaviour at small values of the temperature. In particular, the critical force - temperature curve is reentrant for all $d > 2$. The phase transition between the ballistic and adsorbed phases is first order, except perhaps at $(a_c^0, 1)$. This follows *mutatis mutandis* from the arguments in [9] for the self-avoiding walk model.

When $d = 2$ we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \max[\kappa_0(a), \lambda_0(y)] &\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a,y) \le \max[\kappa(a), \lambda_0(y)]. \end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

Unlike the self-avoiding walk problem [23] we do not have a precise condition for locating the phase boundary when $d = 2$, since we only have lower and upper bounds on the free energy when $a > 1$ and $y > 1$.

7. Pushing a polygon towards an interacting surface

We now consider the situation when $d \ge 3$ and when $0 \le a \le a_c^0$ and $0 < y \le 1$. First consider $0 \le a \le 1$ and $0 < y \le 1$. By theorem 8 we know that

$$\psi_0(a,y) = \psi_0(1,y). \tag{7.1}$$

By theorem 7 it follows that $\lambda_0(y) = \psi_0(1,y) = \psi(1,\sqrt{y}) = \lambda(\sqrt{y})$ (see the discussion of the walk problem in the introduction). But $\lambda(\sqrt{y}) = \log \mu$ for $0 < y \le 1$ [24]. Thus $\psi_0(a,y) = \log \mu$ for $0 \le a \le 1$ and $0 < y \le 1$.

Since $\psi_0(a,y)$ is convex in each of its variables, the critical curve $y_c(a)$ in figure 2 is a non-decreasing function of a. We now show why $y_c(a)$ has a jump discontinuity at $a = a_c^0$ so that the phase boundary between the free and adsorbed phases is a vertical line segment in figure 2. Take

$a = a_c^0 - \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. At $y = 1$, $\psi_0(a, 1) = \log \mu$. But $\psi_0(a, y)$ is monotone non-decreasing in y so it cannot be greater than $\log \mu$ for $y < 1$, so that $\psi_0(a, y) = \log \mu$ since it cannot be smaller than $\log \mu$.

We now give an alternative proof that the phase boundary between the free and adsorbed phases is a vertical line segment in figure 2. In fact this argument proves considerably more and essentially completes our knowledge of the phase diagram when $d \geq 3$. We shall need some preliminary Lemmas. Let $\pi_n^w(a) = \sum_v p_n(v, w)a^v$. By a concatenation argument we can show that the limit

$$\kappa_0^w(a) = \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log \pi_n^w(a) \tag{7.2}$$

exists. For instance, one can use a modification of the concatenation construction used in Section 4 of [13] coupled with a generalized supermultiplicative inequality. Let $\widehat{\pi}_n^w(a) = \sum_{u\leq w} \pi_n^u(a)$. This sum includes all polygons with span at most w.

Lemma 1 *When $d \geq 2$, $\kappa_0^w(a) \leq \kappa_0^{w+1}(a)$.*

Proof: Each polygon contributing to the sum $\pi_n^w(a) = \sum_v p_n(v, w)a^v$ has at least one edge in the hyperplane $x_d = w$. If there is more than one such edge, take the one with lexicographically first midpoint. Translate this edge unit distance into the hyperplane $x_d = w + 1$ and add two edges to reconnect the polygon. Then

$$\pi_n^w(a) \leq \pi_{n+2}^{w+1}(a) \tag{7.3}$$

and taking logarithms, dividing by n and letting $n \to \infty$ completes the proof. □

Lemma 2 *The exponential growth rate of $\widehat{\pi}_n^w(a)$ is identical to that of $\pi_n^w(a)$ for all $w < \infty$.*

Proof: The result follows from the following inequalities:

$$\pi_n^w(a) \leq \widehat{\pi}_n^w(a) \leq (w + 1)\pi_n^w(a) = \exp[\kappa_0^w(a)n + o(n)]. \tag{7.4}$$

□

Lemma 3 *When $d \geq 2$, $\sup_w \kappa_0^w(a) = \kappa_0(a)$.*

Proof: Clearly $\kappa_0^w(a) \leq \kappa_0(a)$ for all w. Write $n = Nr + q$, $0 \leq q < N$. Concatenate r polygons each with N edges, and a final polygon with q edges, using the concatenation construction detailed in Section 4 of [13]. Each polygon with N edges has span no larger than $w = N/2$ so the resulting polygon (with $Nr + q$ edges) has span no larger than $w = N/2$. By the argument leading to (4.14) in [13] this gives

$$n^{-1} \log \widehat{\pi}_n^w(a) \geq N^{-1}(1 - q/n) \log P_N(a, 1) - 2N^{-1}(1 - q/N) \log[(d - 1)N^{d-1}]. \tag{7.5}$$

Hence

$$\kappa_0^w(a) \geq N^{-1} \log P_N(a, 1), \tag{7.6}$$

where we recall that $w = N/2$. As $N \to \infty$ the right hand side goes to $\kappa_0(a)$ so $\sup_w \kappa_0^w(a) \geq \kappa_0(a)$ which completes the proof. □

This allows us to prove the following:

Theorem 11 *When $d \geq 2$*

$$\psi_0(a, y) = \psi_0(a, 1) = \kappa_0(a)$$

for all $0 < y \leq 1$.

Proof: Fix $0 < y \leq 1$. By monotonicity $P_n(a, y) \leq P_n(a, 1)$ so

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a, y) \leq \kappa_0(a). \tag{7.7}$$

By considering one term in the partition function

$$P_n(a, y) \geq y^w \sum_v p_n(v, w) a^v = \pi_n^w(a), \tag{7.8}$$

and

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a, y) \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log \pi_n^w(a) = \kappa_0^w(a) \tag{7.9}$$

for all $w > 0$. Hence

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} n^{-1} \log P_n(a, y) \geq \sup_w \kappa_0^w(a) = \kappa_0(a) \tag{7.10}$$

Then (7.7) and (7.10) prove the theorem. □

In particular, this proves that the phase boundary between the free and adsorbed phases is a vertical line in the (a, y)-phase diagram, at $a = a_c^0$.

8. Discussion

When a polymer is adsorbed at a surface it can be desorbed by applying a force normal to the surface to pull the polymer away from the surface. We already have a number of rigorous results available for the self-avoiding walk model of a linear polymer [23, 25, 26]. The behaviour might depend on polymer architecture and we begin to investigate this issue in this paper by considering a self-avoiding polygon model of a ring polymer.

When the dimension $d \geq 3$ we show that the critical force-temperature curve (*i.e.* the temperature dependence of the force required to desorb the polygon) can be characterized in terms of the free energy of the adsorbed polygon without a force and the free energy of the polygon subject to a force but not interacting with the surface. Similar results are known for the self-avoiding walk model [23], though we also show that the critical force-temperature curve is different for the polygon case. We are able to determine the phase boundaries in the phase diagram in terms of these free energies. When $d = 2$ the situation is more complicated because at most half of the vertices of the polygon can be in contact with the surface. For $d = 2$ we have bounds on the free energy but our results are less complete.

Acknowledgements

EJJvR and SGW acknowledge support in the form of Discovery Grants from NSERC (Canada).

References

[1] Beaton N R 2015 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **48**
[2] Beaton N R, Guttmann A J and Jensen I 2012 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45** 055208
[3] Clisby N and Jensen I 2012 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45** 115202
[4] Conway A R, Enting I G and Guttmann A J 1993 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **26** 1519–1534
[5] De'Bell K and Lookman T 1993 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **65** 87-113

[6] Enting I G 1980 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **13** 3713–3722
[7] Guim I and Burkhardt T W 1989 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **22** 1131-1140
[8] Guttmann A J and Jensen I, in *Polygons, Polyominoes and Polycubes,* ed. A J Guttmann, Lecture Notes in Physics **775** Springer, The Netherlands, (2009)
[9] Guttmann A J, Jensen I and Whittington S G 2014 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47** 015004
[10] Hammersley J M and Morton K W 1954 *J. Roy. Stat. Soc. B* **16** 23-38
[11] Hammersley J M, Torrie G M and Whittington S G 1982 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **15** 539-571
[12] Hammersley J M and Welsh D J A 1962 *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* **13** 108-110
[13] Hammersley J M and Whittington S G 1985 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **18** 101
[14] Haupt B J, Ennis J and Sevick E M 1999 *Langmuir* **15** 3886-389
[15] Hegger R and Grassberger P 1994 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 4069-4081
[16] Ioffe D and Velenik Y 2008 *Analysis and Stochastics of Growth Processes and Interface Models* (ed. Peter Mrters, Roger Moser, Mathew Penrose, Hartmut Schwetlick, and Johannes Zimmer: Oxford University Press Scholarship Online)
[17] Ioffe D and Velenik Y 2010 *Braz. J. Prob. Stat.* **24** 279-299
[18] Janse van Rensburg E J 1998 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **31** 8295-8306
[19] Janse van Rensburg E J 2015 *The Statistical Mechanics of Interacting Walks, Polygons, Animals and Vesicles 2ed.* Oxford University Press.
[20] Janse van Rensburg E J, Orlandini E, Tesi M C and Whittington S G 2008 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **41** 015003
[21] Janse van Rensburg E J, Orlandini E, Tesi M C and Whittington S G 2009 *J. Stat. Mech.* P07014
[22] Janse van Rensburg E J and Rechnitzer A 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 6875-6898
[23] Janse van Rensburg E J and Whittington S G 2013 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **46** 435003
[24] Janse van Rensburg E J and Whittington S G 2016 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49** 11LT01
[25] Janse van Rensburg E J and Whittington S G 2016 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49** 244001
[26] Janse van Rensburg E J and Whittington S G 2017 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **50** 055001
[27] Jensen I 2004 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **37** 5503–5524
[28] Jensen I 2013 A new transfer-matrix algorithm for exact enumerations: self-avoiding walks on the square lattice, arXiv 1309.6709
[29] Krawczyk J, Owczarek A L, Prellberg T and Rechnitzer A 2005 *J. Stat. Mech.* P05008
[30] Mishra P K, Kumar S and Singh Y 2005 *Europhys. Letters* **69** 102-108
[31] Rychlewski G and Whittington S G 2011 *J. Stat. Phys.* **45** 661-668
[32] Schmidt M and Lipson H 2009 *Science*, **324** no. 5923, 81 - 85
[33] Skvortsov A M, Klushin L I, Polotsky A A and Binder K 2012 *Phys. Rev. E* **85** 031803
[34] Soteros C E 1992 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** 3153-3173
[35] Soteros C E and Whittington S G 1988 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **21** L857-L861
[36] Whittington S G 1975 *J. Chem. Phys.* **63** 779-785
[37] Zhang W and Zhang X 2003 *Prog. Polym. Sci.* **28** 1271-1295